



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/717,542	11/21/2003	Sung-Su Jung	8734.257.00 US	7958
30827 7590 06/08/2009 MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP 1900 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20006				
EXAMINER TADESSE, YEWEDBAR T				
ART UNIT 1792		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 06/08/2009		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/717,542

Applicant(s)

JUNG ET AL.

Examiner

YEWEBDAR T. TADESSE

Art Unit

1792

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 March 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-9, 11-12 and 15-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 15-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-9, 11, 12 and 21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 03/06/2009 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-12 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 is unclear for lack of proper antecedent basis and others: In claim 1, line 8; the phrase "a plurality of syringes affixed at each supports" is read as "a plurality of syringes affixed at each support".

In claim 1, lines 8-9; the phrase "the number of the syringe of support being same as..." is read as "the number of the syringes of each support (one of the supports) being the same as..."

In claim 1, lines 11-12; the phrase "the syringe dispense dispensing material in only one image display part" is read as "one of the syringes dispenses dispensing material in only one of the plurality of image display parts".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) The invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-12 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Tisone et al (US 6,063,339).

6. As to claim 1, Tisone et al discloses (see Fig 1-2, 6 and column 22, lines 16-31) a dispenser capable of dispensing liquid crystal on display panel comprising, a substrate on which a plurality of image display parts arranged in a plurality columns and lines; a table (112) on which the substrate is loaded; supports (502) above the table (see column 22, lines 16-33 for multiple dispensers arranged in parallel), the number of supports capable of corresponding to the number of column or line of image display parts; and a plurality of syringes (512) affixed at each support (502) to dispense a material on the substrate, the number of the syringes of each support capable of being the same as to the number of the image display part in the corresponding column or line; wherein the supports are independently driven (see Abstract for moving head and column 22, lines 16-21 for independently provided dispensers) from each other so that

one of plurality of the syringes capable of dispensing material in only one of the plurality of image display parts.

7. As to claim 5, in Tisone et al the table is moved in forward/backward and left/right directions (see Abstract).

Regarding claims 2-3, 6-9, 11-12 and 21, the claimed limitations are intended use of the apparatus related to the substrate and the coating material. These limitations do not add structure to the claimed apparatus.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

10. Claims 1-3 and 5-9, 11-12 and 21 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicants' admitted art (see Fig 3) in view of Tisone et al (US 6,063,339).

With respect to claim 1, applicants' admitted art discloses (see Fig 3) the claimed invention except for a plurality of supports. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to include a plurality of supports, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8. In any event, it is known to arrange a plurality of supports, such as Tisone et al teaches array of dispensers; see column 22, lines 16-21), wherein the supports are independently driven (see Abstract for moving head and column 22, lines 16-21 for independently provided dispensers) from each other. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a plurality of supports to provide array dispensing.

As to claim 5, in the admitted art the table is moved in forward/backward and left/right directions (see arrows in Fig 3).

Regarding claims 2-3, 6-9, 11-12 and 21, the claimed limitations are intended use of the apparatus related to the substrate and the coating material. These limitations do not add structure to the claimed apparatus.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicants' arguments filed 02/24/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants mainly argue (see page 7) that the relationship between the number of the multiple dispensers (502) and the number of the column or line of the image display parts is not disclosed in Tisone. It is noted that applicants' argument is directed to the types of the substrate, whereas at the issues here are structural limitations of the apparatus. As explained above in the rejection, Tisone meet the structural limitations of applicants' claimed apparatus.

A claim containing a "recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus" if the prior art apparatus shows all of the structural limitations of the claim. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1987) Furthermore, "expressions relating the apparatus to contents thereof during an intended operation are of no significance in determining patentability of the apparatus claim." *Ex parte Thibault*, 164 USPQ 666,667 (Bd. App. 1969). Thus, the "inclusion of material or article worked upon does not impart patentability to the claims." *In re Young*, 75 F.2d 966, 25 USPQ 69 (CCPA 1935) (as restated in *In re Otto*, 312 F.2d 937, 136 (USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963)). In this case the inclusion of the substrate with a plurality of image display parts is arranged in a plurality of columns and lines do not impart patentability to the claims.

The image display parts are not part of the apparatus. As written claim 1 requires "supports" so it would need at least two, but not necessary the same number as the number of columns or lines of parts. In any event Tisone teaches array of dispensers each provided with a plurality of syringes to form array of dispensed

materials. For at least the reasons described above the examiner maintains the rejection over Tisone.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to YEWEBDAR T. TADESSE whose telephone number is (571)272-1238. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nadine Norton can be reached on (571) 272-1465. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Yewebdar T Tadesse/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1792

Application/Control Number: 10/717,542
Art Unit: 1792

Page 8